LIBRARY COPY

THEOSOPHY

A MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO

THE THEOSOPHICAL MOVEMENT, AND THE BROTHERHOOD OF HUMANITY

THE STUDY OF OCCULT SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY, AND ARYAN LITERATURE

Vol. XXXVIII—No. 5 **March, 1950**

William Q. Judge

April 13, 1851—March 21, 1896

THE *"Society" of Adepts is one which has no place of meeting, which exacts no dues, which has no constitution or by-laws other than the eternal laws of nature. The Sages we speak of, and their disciples, carry with them the indelible mark and speak the well-known words that show they are beings developed under laws, and not merely persons who, having undergone a childish ordeal, are possessed of a diploma. The Adepts may be called rugged oaks that have no disguise.* —W.Q.J.

CONTENTS

PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE....193
MARS AND MERCURY....198
ESOTERIC TEACHING....202
THE DIVINE PROPORTION....209
"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS....212
FREE WILL—OR FREE CHOICE?....216
YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— 219
THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMME....222
TRANS-SOLAR SPACE AND NEBULAE....225
OPEN SESAME! 228
ON THE LOOKOUT....230

$3.50 per Annum *35 Cents per Copy*

Edited and Published by

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California, U. S. A.

Publisher's Announcements

THEOSOPHY: Established November, 1912, by Robert Crosbie. Published monthly by the Theosophy Company, at Los Angeles, California, U. S. A. This Magazine is an independent Journal, unconnected with any theosophical society or other organization. The Publishers assume full responsibility for all unsigned articles herein.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: No subscriptions are accepted for less than one year of 12 numbers, but subscriptions may begin with any desired number. All subscriptions, orders for single back numbers, and back volumes, bound or unbound, should be accompanied by the necessary remittance. Price $3.50 per annum; single numbers of the current volume, 35 cents each; back numbers, 50 cents each; back volumes, unbound, $5.00 each; for library style binding, prices on request. *Volumes I and XII are out of print.*

COMMUNICATIONS: Contributions submitted for publication should be typewritten double-spaced on one side of the paper only, with wide margins, and copies should be in all cases retained by the writers, as no manuscripts are returned.

CORRESPONDENCE: Letters from subscribers and readers are welcomed, with criticisms, comments or questions on any subject treated in the magazine. Questions on Theosophical Philosophy and History will be replied to direct, or, if of sufficient general interest, in the pages of the magazine.

BEQUESTS AND DONATIONS: Gifts and legacies will be gladly received from those in sympathy with the objects of this Magazine when such benefactions are unencumbered and unrestricted. Donors should make their gifts to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY, of Los Angeles, California, U. S. A., which is an incorporated association, legally empowered to receive such donations and bequests in furtherance of its objects. These objects are:

(a) To form the nucleus of a universal Brotherhood of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color;

(b) The study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study; and

(c) The investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY
245 West 33rd Street
Los Angeles (7), California, U. S. A.

A U M

Tell him, O Aspirant, that true devotion may bring him back the knowledge, that knowledge which was his in former births. The deva-sight and deva-hearing are not obtained in one short birth. —*The Voice of the Silence*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXVIII **March, 1950** **No. 5**

PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

SOME readers may wonder why this magazine, besides reprinting the magazine articles of H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge, continues to revive the theosophical controversies of sixty and seventy years ago. Is not what is past, gone? Is not the present the determinant of the future? Or shall the theosophist of today attempt to approximate the view of the Master quoted in *The Secret Doctrine* as saying, "I feel irritated at having to use these three clumsy words —Past, Present, and Future—miserable concepts of the objective phases of the subjective whole, they are about as ill-adapted for the purpose as an axe for fine carving"? The past is not gone until human nature has radically changed, and no future will be significant until man's problems are fundamentally different from what they have been for, as it is said, "a million years."

Let us consider again that part of the Present which "was" 1891 and the years immediately following. H. P. Blavatsky in May of that year had gone "Home," leaving her pupils, the members of the Theosophical Society, and the public at large with nothing—except her writings, her sixteen years of public representation of the Movement, and, for those who sensed her unique immortality, her Presence. Theosophical students who had not appreciated H.P.B.'s position, responsibility, or function while she lived were in many cases temporarily thrown into a state of fulsome worship of the "departed" H.P.B. This was often neither genuine gratitude nor even belated recognition, but simply the devious expression of a

desire to borrow for themselves some of the glory reflected from their Teacher.

Mr. Judge, oddly enough, regarded H.P.B. in the same way *after* May, 1891, as he had before—time, place and circumstance not being the determining factors in his view of the Teacher. Mr. Judge studied the *Secret Doctrine* as usual, and went about spreading its teachings to the best of his ability, quite as if H.P.B. were still present to teach, confirm, elucidate, encourage and inspire. He continued to follow the program of the Theosophical Movement as if 1892 were the same as 1891, or 1888, or, for that matter, 1875. Those whose feelings and convictions suffered a radical change when they thought H.P.B. had gone, and who did not realize that they had merely exchanged one mistaken notion of the Teacher for another, were bound to think that W.Q.J.—who changed not at all—was acting very strangely.

As the months went by, separating the faint-hearted, the mentally lazy and obtuse, from the vanished H.P.B., some became seriously alarmed by Judge's dogged consistency, by his loyalty to (as they conceived it) a Teacher-that-was. Judge acted as if Mme. Blavatsky's character—not only her books—were still a vital issue! The New York *Sun* libel case, still in progress in May, 1891, was automatically over, for under law, at least, libel proceedings had no standing after the death of the principal. But Judge continued the suit on a technicality, secured a judgment, and when the *Sun's* retraction was published he dedicated the newspaper space provided for him to a long article on—"The Esoteric She."

At the same time, and long after it had gone out of fashion to pay tributes to H. P. Blavatsky, Mr. Judge quietly took issue with other detractors of H.P.B. Personal opinions he neither noticed nor himself advanced: he based his case on the incontrovertible evidence existing in the published writings on Theosophy. This one and that might circulate without let or ceasing all manner of individual views of Theosophy, the Masters, and H.P.B.—but H.P.B.'s own declarations, the Masters' public statements, and the theosophical teachings certified by Them were always kept available in clear and undiluted terms by Mr. Judge. W.Q.J.'s campaigns, first and last, were unique. All other contestants sought personal vindication; Judge, in whose nature Theosophy was the *living power,* strove not

to win battles but to teach Theosophy. For this reason, his "side" of the controversies still retains its value: the rest lost point and significance with the disappearance of the personalities involved.

An example is A. P. Sinnett, who failed to grasp the fundamental principle of Theosophy—the law of correspondence and analogy—and therefore could not but materialize the doctrines; who, curiously, ignored a plain statement of intention and fact made by the Master he professed to revere, and subsequently began to discredit H.P.B. as Agent and Messenger of the Masters. Sinnett's three-fold repudiation of H.P.B., her Teachers, and Theosophy did not begin in 1891, but, for Sinnett as for others, May 8th of that year signalized a great change in the relation between H. P. Blavatsky and Theosophy. In some quarters the feeling was that H.P.B.'s connection with Theosophy and the Movement had abruptly terminated. The fact is—and Mr. Judge cleared away both underbrush and camouflage so that it stood out in the open—the fundamental relationship between H.P.B. as Messenger and the body of teachings she recorded *had never been grasped.* (Sinnett's disquisition on "Esoteric Teaching" is reprinted elsewhere in this issue, and previous numbers of THEOSOPHY, beginning with December, 1949, give the major articles of the series.)

The present-day student can assume that Mr. Sinnett's article is a contemporary expression, since it would be a mistake to think that no such views are held even in our time, or that there exists no need to discover why a mind like Sinnett's should have failed, from beginning to end, to see H. P. Blavatsky *in the light of Theosophy.*

What, we may ask, is the essential difference between Sinnett and Judge in their adherence to Theosophy, the Movement, and H.P.B.? Sinnett's close working with Mme. Blavatsky in the early days was a matter of public knowledge at the time; his unique position as a "lay chela" of the Masters was known through his books, articles, and personal contacts; he was prominent in India and later in London. Yet one of his most characteristic works was *Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky* (1886)—an "official" biography of one who had tried, in all ways, to "appear as nothing in the eyes of men." (This book was published against H.P.B.'s inclination, plainly expressed to Sinnett at the time, although her wishes did not have weight against his pleading and insistence.)

With all its merits, the *Incidents* gives the flavor of psychism rather than the reality of occultism. The pomp of kings, the glory of station, the glamor of supernatural powers—these worldly lights Sinnett played upon the heroine of his piece, and it was no wonder that the portrait to emerge was not that of the "Esoteric She."

William Q. Judge's close working with H.P.B. began several years before Sinnett made her acquaintance in India, and continued long after Sinnett had exhausted his patience with the strange Russian noblewoman whose theosophic role was so bewildering to him. Judge's contact and correspondence with Adepts are not to be established by published evidence, and a few printed excerpts are all that attest his receipt of H.P.B.'s "long letters—there are some of forty-eight pages—in which many a puzzle is explained with profound affection," according to Mrs. Keightley (Judge *Letters,* p. 264). Judge, despite the years of his work in America, was anything but a prominent figure in the Society. He had written no books, and in the magazine, *The Path,* which he edited and chiefly wrote, his policy was that of virtual anonymity. Moreover, *The Path* had little to offer the kama-manasic temperament which finds interest in personal doings of prominent people, differences of opinion, and dissensions among individuals, and its "political" influence in the Society was therefore nil. H. P. Blavatsky described the *Path* magazine as "pure *Buddhi,*" a tribute to Judge's power to take hold of an essential principle—the root of a difficulty, a controversy, a problem, or an event—and find the way and the words to make it evident to other minds. This was scarcely the mark of an ambitious member or a prominent official, and Mr. Judge's indifference to organizational "rewards" was unmistakable. Whatever his abilities as an organizer, W.Q.J. was not given to the creation of theosophical institutions nor "spiritual" bureaucracies. His genius lay in the promotion of Theosophy itself, and his efforts never drew special attention to himself, *his* notions, his *position.*

Where stand A. P. Sinnett and Wm. Q. Judge *today?* What has altered since they thought and wrote? If the removal of their time, place, and circumstance has permitted a clearer view of the issue joined by their interchange, does this mean that the principle has been recognized once for all—or merely that a certain segment of theosophical history has been memorized? There are none now to

claim independent instruction from the Theosophical Adepts, to supply "corrections" for Mme. Blavatsky's works, to contest her Agency and override the plain statements by her Teachers and superiors—or are these very things still going on among those who call themselves, and think themselves, theosophists? Do theosophists refer to the original literature as they would, say, to H.P.B. herself, were she on the scene? And if not, why not? Are dissensions and differences settled by consultation of the "lines laid down," without recourse to personal preferences, desires, theories—and grievances? Or are the *Five Messages,* the *Key to Theosophy,* and H.P.B.'s many articles on the theosophic life relegated to the solid-reading shelf and read through, now and then, like dry texts for an advanced course we may someday have to take?

Suppose Mr. Judge had not been on hand to reply to "Esoteric Teaching"—the student eventually must gather his forces and his theosophical resources and answer for himself, for his own sake and, if he chooses, out of gratitude to the Teacher, H. P. Blavatsky. Judge's reply is made (and will be reprinted, for the first time, in the April issue). It is in one sense past, but it is also present, and —in a "future" which is not to be counted by Time—there is hope that the position assumed by William Q. Judge will be the "eternal present" for many other workers in the Theosophical Movement.

The great theosophist who combined in himself so much of the timeless wisdom, energy and power of India, Ireland, and America did not live merely from April 13, 1851 to March 21, 1896: the Being known as "W.Q.J." only appeared to come and go. In reality, his existence, like that of every soul, is unbroken and continuous. As with the few in all ages, the phases of his objective life shadow forth the subjective whole, and make a mockery of the clumsy words—Past, Present, and Future.

Evolutionary Time

It is not possible to evade the law of evolution, but that law need not always be carried out in *one* way. If the same result is produced, it is enough. Hence, in any one hour or minute, the being attaining adeptship could pass through countless experiences *in effect.* —W.Q.J.

MARS AND MERCURY

[Only two months after the third installment of "The Earth Chain of Globes" (see February THEOSOPHY) appeared, the "Literary Notes" editor of *The Path* was "glamoured" by a London Lodge Transaction into commending a direct contradiction of the teachings of *The Secret Doctrine.* The review of W. Scott Elliot's paper, "The Evolution of Humanity," enthused in this wise:

"For long time the London Lodge has apparently been quiescent, Mr. Sinnett's rich lectures ceasing to delight the Theosophic world, but a new and worthy revival is in the present noble issue. It is beautifully clear and intelligible, with language choice and melodious, full of thought and fact in graceful form. The first paragraph affirms that much of its contents is for the first time given to the world, and the second that the writer is merely the mouthpiece of an authoritative statement, the questions which 'elicited' the information having been originally formulated by the discussions of a group in the London Lodge. This language is very significant, and doubtless went as far as the author felt prudent short of direct avowal of the quarter to which the questions were addressed and the means by which replies were received. Only a reviewer thoroughly at home in the *Secret Doctrine* could indicate the added revelations, but the beautiful clearness of the paper, and its freedom from confusion and wandering, are equal to a revelation. One of its many interesting facts is that Mars is the planet we last occupied, and that Mercury is in preparation to be next * * *. [A.F.]"

Mr. Judge, in the following issue of *The Path* (July, 1893), gave first place to the editorial correction reprinted below, which in turn drew forth A. P. Sinnett's dissertation on "Esoteric Teaching" (see p. 202). It is of interest that the July *Path* also contained the announcement of *The Ocean of Theosophy* (issued early in June), in which Mr. Judge gave prominent place to the theosophical doctrine of rounds and races. The lead article in August, 1893, was "The Adepts and Modern Science" (reprinted in THEOSOPHY XXXI, 71), which is an invaluable treatment of the purposes of the Theosophical Movement, and reveals the wider implications of Sinnett's "mistaken notions."—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

IN the June *Path* there was printed a review of a pamphlet issued by the London Lodge T. S., and this magazine may perhaps be construed as committed to an approval of everything contained in the pamphlet, although the private initials of the reviewer were annexed to the remarks. The pamphlet referred to brings up an

old dispute which we had thought was settled by what is found in *The Secret Doctrine,* Vol. I, running from page 162 to 168. "Gratification of curiosity is the end of knowledge for some men," wrote H.P.B.'s teacher, and this curiosity led to a question being put some years ago to the Adepts, who furnished the main body of *Esoteric Buddhism* and all the important matter in *The Secret Doctrine,* in respect to other visible globes. The author of *Esoteric Buddhism* then construed the reply to mean that Mars and Mercury are two of the seven planets of the earth-chain of globes. H.P.B., the only person in actual and constant communication with the Masters, corrected the mistake made by Mr. Sinnett in the pages of *The Secret Doctrine* to which I have referred, saying on page 164: "But neither Mars nor Mercury belongs to our chain; they are, along with the other planets, septenary units in the great host of 'chains,' and all are as visible as their upper globes are invisible." Her correction of the misconception was made upon the written authority of the same Masters who sent through her the letters on which *Esoteric Buddhism* was written.

On the ground of authority in respect to this question, about which none of the Theosophical writers have any information independent of what the Masters have written, we must conclude that the statement in *The Secret Doctrine* is final. If no other point were involved, there would be no necessity for going further with the matter, but as the consistency of the entire philosophy is involved, it is necessary to advert again to this subject.

The two Masters who had to do with *Esoteric Buddhism* and *The Secret Doctrine* have distinctly said:—*first,* that none of the other Globes of the earth-chain are visible from its surface; *second,* that various planets are visible in the sky to us because they are in their turn fourth-plane planets, representing to our sight their own septenary chains; *third,* that the six companion globes of the earth are united with it in one mass, but differ from it as to class of substance; *fourth,* that Mr. Sinnett misunderstood them when he thought they meant to say that Mars and Mercury were two of the six fellow globes of the earth,—and this correction they make most positively in *The Secret Doctrine; lastly,* they have said that the entire philosophy is one of correspondences, and must be so viewed in every part. We do not understand that Mr. Sinnett has said that H.P.B. was

not reporting the Masters when she wrote the above in *The Secret Doctrine,* or that the Masters have denied that they hold the above views.

If we admit that Mars and Mercury are two visible planets of the seven-fold chain belonging to the earth, then the consistency of the philosophy is destroyed, for as it is with planets, so it is with man. Every planet, considered for the moment as an individual, is to be analysed in the same way as a single human being, subject to the same laws in the same way. Hence, if two of the principles of the earth are visible, that is, Mars and Mercury, then why is it that two of man's seven principles are not visible, in addition to his body? In his seven-fold constitution his body represents the earth in her septenary chain, but he cannot see objectively any other of his principles. The philosophy must be consistent throughout. If it is inconsistent at one point it fails at every other. The same Masters who have communicated through H.P.B. with Mr. Sinnett for the purpose of having *Esoteric Buddhism* written, have over and over again positively stated that the law of correspondence rules throughout in this philosophy.

The earth is a fourth-plane planet. The beings upon it are now in the fourth stage, and for that reason cannot see objectively any planet that is not on the same plane of development, and every planet which they see is for that reason a fourth-plane planet. If this be correct, then Mars and Mercury must be fourth-plane planets, and hence not in the earth's chain of globes.

If we assume with the writer of the pamphlet referred to that Mars and Mercury are two out of the whole seven of which the earth is a third, then the question arises, To what principle do these two planets correspond?, for they must correspond to either *prana, kama,* astral body, *Manas, Buddhi,* or *Atman.* Any attempt at an answer to this question will show the confusion in the assumption; for it is admitted that Mars is in obscuration, and the natural question then would be, Which of the earth's principles is correspondingly in obscuration? In attempting to answer this from the assumption started with, we have the statement that Mars is the planet we have last been in, hence it must represent a disused faculty or principle, and not one which we are about to develop. As *Manas* is the next principle to be fully developed, it would follow that Mars

does not represent it, and hence the whole matter falls into confusion, because the first four principles have been already developed and are not in disuse. Following this on the false assumption, then Mars would represent an eighth principle.

Mars is in a state of obscuration at the present time, as stated by the Masters and H.P.B. This is because, in that chain of development, the Egos have finished their fourth round, or because the fourth round has not yet commenced, except in respect to the planet itself as a place of habitation, the Egos having passed on to the next globe of that chain, quite as invisible from the surface of Mars as our next globe in order is invisible from our surface. The same may be said for Mercury, except in respect to obscuration, since the information vouchsafed about it declares that it is beginning to get out of the obscuration caused by the absence of Egos.

A reference to the pages of the *Secret Doctrine* referred to above will be found helpful on this point. It is also stated on page 163 of that book, Vol. I, on the authority of the Masters, that "No companion planet, that is, no upper globes of any chain in the solar system, can be seen." I may say that the relation borne by Mars and Mercury to the earth will not be spoken of or explained by the Masters. Furthermore, one of the Masters wrote to the author of *Esoteric Buddhism* in respect to this matter, stating, "You are putting me questions pertaining to the highest initiation. I can give you only a general view, but I dare not, nor will I, enter upon details."

It is not necessary for us to know the relation between Mars, Mercury, and the Earth, especially, nor to know whether Mars and Mercury are in any particular state; all that is necessary is to know, do they or not belong to our chain? And that they do not has been distinctly stated, both from the position of authority and upon the ground of consistent philosophy. Upon authority, because in no other way can we solve this riddle; upon philosophy to show the reasonableness of the authoritative statement. All such difficulties can be solved by remembering and working upon the law that, as it is in respect to man and his principles or vehicles, so it is in respect to any planet whatever.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

ESOTERIC TEACHING

SOME recent references in the *Path* to portions of the original esoteric teachings embodied by me in *Esoteric Buddhism* seem to call for remarks on my part in reply. The line of criticism in question has culminated in an article which appears in the *Path* for July, entitled "Mars and Mercury."

The point at issue is this:—In the original teaching which I received from the Masters I was definitely informed that the planets Mars and Mercury formed part of the septenary chain to which our own world belongs. The question is one which, on its own merits, will only be of interest within the area of serious Theosophic study; but the controversy that has now arisen really involves some of the deepest questions affecting the future well-being of the Theosophical Society and the progress of the movement. It is for this reason that I feel bound to take it up.

For a long time after the publication of *Esoteric Buddhism* the statement concerning Mars and Mercury remained unchallenged. It scarcely seemed possible that any one imbued with respect for the Masters' teaching could challenge it, because, as has been publicly stated, after the publication of *Esoteric Buddhism* the great Adept who gave me the information wrote to me declaring explicitly that it constituted a correct exposition of his teaching. His words were:—"Be certain that with the few undetectable mistakes and omissions notwithstanding, your *Esoteric Buddhism* is the only right exposition, however incomplete, of our occult doctrines. You have made no cardinal, fundamental mistakes, and whatever may be given to you hereafter will not clash with a single sentence in your book, but, on the contrary, will explain away any seeming contradiction."

In later years when the *Secret Doctrine* was published by Madame Blavatsky, I found to my great surprise that she had asserted a new view of the planetary chain, altogether at variance with that previously given out, and had represented the seven planets of that

---

NOTE.—This article by A. P. Sinnett, author of *The Occult World* (1881) and *Esoteric Buddhism* (1883), was first published in *The Path,* September, 1893.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

chain as seven different states of this earth, making out Mars and Mercury to be in no way associated with the evolution of our human family, but simply to be themselves the objective planets, corresponding to the earth, of other chains. On the basis of this declaration some Theosophical students have felt bound by their loyalty to Madame Blavatsky to put aside the earlier teachings of the Masters conveyed through myself, and to argue that I misunderstood my instructions. This view is emphasized with great vigor in the *Path,*—in the article above referred to, signed by Mr. Judge,—and the really important point developed by the controversy has to do with the question, What was Madame Blavatsky's position really in the occult world, and what kind of authority should be attached to the writings she has left behind her?

I hope no one will take the explanation I am now forced to give as implying any abandonment by me of the position respecting Madame Blavatsky I have always maintained. I showed in the fragmentary biography I put together at her own wish, with the assistance of herself and members of her family, under the title *Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky,* that she was truly in close relations with the great Masters of esoteric wisdom. That she was one of their partially initiated disciples was also unquestionable for anyone who has been in independent touch with the realities of the occult world. She was what she always called herself, a *chela,* or pupil of the Masters, generally described by them by the term *upasika,* well-known in the East as signifying a female *chela;* and when the teaching first came to me in preparation for the book which I ultimately wrote, Madame Blavatsky eagerly perused the letters I received in reply to my elaborate questions, assuring me constantly that the information they contained was almost as new to her as it was to me, except in so far as a part of it was vaguely present to her mind without having ever been formulated with precision. Through her it was in the first instance undoubtedly that I came into communication with the Masters, and in many ways for many years, during some of which she had few other friends, I endeavored to show my appreciation of the debt of gratitude, in this respect, I owed her. But the matter we have now to deal with has nothing to do with personal relationships. I have to defend the teaching of which I was made the exponent,

and now that the subject has been forced so prominently to the front, I cannot leave Theosophists to suppose I acquiesce in the claims that have been made to correct my faithful exposition of the occult doctrine.

It is not my business here to offer hypotheses to account for the strange misapprehensions into which Madame Blavatsky fell when writing the *Secret Doctrine,* not merely as regards these questions of Mars and Mercury, but also in regard to some other points which have not yet attracted attention. That Madame Blavatsky was capable of making mistakes when endeavoring to amplify and expand the occult teaching of the Masters is the all-important conclusion to which I think all unbiassed minds in the Theosophical Society must be brought by a consideration of the matter under discussion. In endeavoring to show, on p. 163, vol. I of the *Secret Doctrine,* that I misunderstood the teaching in reference to Mars and Mercury, Madame Blavatsky quotes a question which I put to the Master, K.H., and his reply.

Here I must add a few words of explanation of the circumstances under which the correspondence in question came to be available for quotation. When I returned to England in 1883 and published *Esoteric Buddhism*—long before Madame Blavatsky ever thought of returning to this country—the most earnest Theosophists of that day were exceedingly eager to see the original papers on the basis of which that volume had been written. I used to read portions of the correspondence at meetings of the Society, and many members pressed me eagerly for permission to take copies of them. I referred the matter to the Master himself, and in the first instance he distinctly expressed disapproval of the idea. The letters, as he pointed out, were written to me, to inform my own mind, in order that I might in turn put out their substance in a suitable literary shape. They would not be intelligible to others unfamiliar with the course of the correspondence on both sides, and so on. The urgent desire, however, of certain Theosophists made me feel as though I were selfishly withholding from them documents which we all reverenced very sincerely, and at a later date—to my lasting regret—I was induced to apply a second time to the Master for leave to have some of these letters copied. He gave me that leave then, enjoining me to take a solemn pledge from persons to whom I gave

the copies that they would never be made use of in any way without my permission.

Under these conditions the great bulk of my correspondence with the Mahatmas, in so far as it related to Theosophical teaching, was copied and treasured for a time by the persons to whom I gave it. Several years later, when Madame Blavatsky was living in this country, she naturally acquired overwhelming influence over a great many members of the Society. She desired one of these to give up to her the copies that had been received from me. The member in question conceived her orders to over-ride the original pledge, and gave them up. They have since been scattered about the world, so that I have seen extracts from them in the *Path* and elsewhere, and for want of the interpretation that would have been suggested if the original letters of enquiry from me had also been printed, provoking misapprehensions on the part of those who only in this way read half the correspondence.

Now, the original question relating to Mars was as follows:—"What planets of those known to ordinary science, besides Mercury, belong to our system of worlds?" The question took that form because information concerning the association of Mercury with our chain of worlds as the next planet on which this body of humanity was destined to evolve, had been given to me previously. The answer was:—"Mars and four other planets, of which astronomy knows nothing. Neither A, B, nor Y, Z are known, nor can they be seen through physical means, however perfected." The answer is incorrectly quoted in the *Secret Doctrine,* and is made to run,—"Mars, *etc.,* and four other planets . . ." The interpolation of this "etc." lends color to the view Madame Blavatsky was at the time maintaining, viz., that while I had intended to ask a question concerning *our chain,* the Master thought I meant to ask a question about the *solar system* at large. This idea is a strange one for an occultist to have accepted. An Adept dealing with his pupil could not make such a mistake about his meaning. But internal evidence makes it obvious that no such mistake was made. If the question had related to the solar system, it would have been absurd. "What planets besides Mercury belong to the solar system?" The question would have been ridiculous in that form—the answer almost more so,—"Mars and four others . . ." invisible to telescopes. What about

Jupiter and Saturn, and all the invisible planets of the other world systems?

Madame Blavatsky, as all who knew her intimately are well aware, was capable of making any imaginable mistake in matters relating to physical science. Her mind was out of tune with all such matters. But how the friends who helped her with the proofs of the *Secret Doctrine,* even without having their eyes opened by knowing that the "etc." was an interpolation, could have let this passage pass, is very surprising. Finally, be it observed that "A, B, and Y, Z," were the names assigned by agreement at that period of my correspondence with the Master to the first, second, sixth, and seventh globes of our chain. The notion that there could be any ambiguity about my question or the answer, in the circumstances, is an insult to common sense,—not to speak of Adept wisdom. I am entitled to add that at a very recent date, within the last few months since this subject has been under discussion, the Master himself in communication with me made the following comment on the situation:—"If I had been capable of paltering with the truth, and playing with words in the way which had been attributed to me, not one line of all the manuscript of mine in your possession would have been worth the paper it is written on."

Few persons in touch with the principles of occultism will be surprised to hear me quoting recent words addressed to me by the Master. Relations like those which were established between my humble self and Him in days gone by are of a kind that do not come to an end except through the misconduct or faithlessness of the pupil. During Madame Blavatsky's lifetime my privileges of communication with the Master through channels of which she knew nothing were private and personal, and I was precluded from speaking of them. That prohibition has since been removed. Madame Blavatsky disliked anything that savored of interference with her rights as founder of the Theosophical Society, and while she lived no one else would have been allowed to speak on behalf of the Masters to the Society at large. But it will be obvious on reflection that unless the whole design of occult teaching is a delusion also, fresh neophytes as time goes on must come within the scope of the personal teaching of the Masters. In this respect we are moving forward now in a new era. I should be the last person to claim

any monopoly—such as Madame Blavatsky in a certain sense enjoyed while she lived—of the honor of conveying teaching from the Masters. No one now left in the Society, I should think, could be so unwise as to make claims of that nature. But as it has been my duty in the past to put the teaching of the Mahatmas before the world, so it looks probable that such tasks will present themselves again, and on this account it is that I am bound at the present crisis to speak rather more plainly than inclination in other circumstances would have prompted.

For many Theosophists, I know, Madame Blavatsky represented the whole movement, but, great as she was, the movement is something much greater. For many such persons Madame Blavatsky may have been the only teacher from whom they received occult enlightenment. Immense as my respect is for her attainments, for her industry and devotion to the work she undertook, it is, nevertheless, a fact that I myself did not receive my Theosophic teaching directly from her, but in the way described; and long before her death my relations with the Master were carried on through the intermediation of one of his *chelas,* quite outside the range of Madame Blavatsky's connexions. It ought to be for all earnest workers in the Theosophical movement a matter of great satisfaction that this is so, because in this way an entirely independent line of confirmation is provided for much that Madame Blavatsky has taught, for the *bona fides* of her position in its broadest aspects, and for the much-discussed existence of the Masters.

Following the quotation from my letter given in the *Secret Doctrine* as above described, comes a letter as printed in that volume with many passages omitted, in which Madame Blavatsky seems to give a correction, derived by her from the Master himself, confirming her view of the planetary chain. Here, again, minute comment upon the entangled situation is very difficult. I can only say that the omitted passages would materially alter the interpretation the letter seems to bear, and that some words obviously put in by Madame Blavatsky in parentheses must not be understood to have existed in the original.

Of course it matters very little for most people in this country first awakening to the significance of Theosophic teaching, whether Mars and Mercury are connected with this earth in the manner de-

scribed or not; but what is of immense importance—in order that the movement, carried on loyally and rationally, shall always continue a healthy living organization, in touch with higher wisdom—is that all persons interested in its progress should shun the disastrous mistake of stereotyping the utterances of Madame Blavatsky—or of anyone else outside of the Masters—as the final word of esoteric teaching, and an infallible testimony to constitute a new body of dogmatic scripture and lead the human understanding once more into the quagmires of bigotry and sectarianism.

A few words must be given in conclusion to some points in Mr. Judge's recent article. When he says the two Masters who have had to do with *Esoteric Buddhism* and the *Secret Doctrine* have decided distinctly, first, that no other globes of the earth chain are visible from its surface, etc., etc., and that "Mr. Sinnett misunderstood them when he thought they meant to say Mars and Mercury were two of the six fellow-globes of the earth," I can only affirm for the guidance of those who may be able to feel that I speak with some claim to be listened to in such a matter, that I am quite sure Mr. Judge entirely mistakes, and that the Masters in question never said anything of the sort. The argument which endeavors to draw a correspondence between the organization of the septenary chain and the seven principles of man is one which rests on an entirely false analogy. It would be as reasonable to attempt to trace an analogy between the seven principles of man and the seven days of the week. There is an analogy between the principles of man and the principles *of the earth*—or of any other individual planet, visible or invisible,—but seven is a terrible stumbling-block for Theosophical students who know there is something in it without knowing very much more.

Finally, in quoting from one of the letters to me by the Master which were got at under the circumstances I have described above, Mr. Judge represents him as saying, "You are putting me questions pertaining to the highest initiation. I can give a general view, but I cannot and dare not enter upon details." It was scarcely fair of Mr. Judge to bring in the passage quoted, as though it bore on the matter in hand. It related to enquiries which had nothing to do with Mars and Mercury, but to a totally different question.

A. P. SINNETT

THE DIVINE PROPORTION

"But what, O Arjuna, hast thou to do
with so much knowledge as this?"
—*Bhagavad Gita*

THE awe-inspiring terms such as Eternity, Infinity and Absoluteness, while containing in themselves the promise of un-ending growth and attainment, sometimes overwhelm the mind with a sense of futility and despair. If the One Reality is out of all relation to finite, conditioned existence, if all stages of growth and understanding, however high, are only relative to past and future achievements, what hope is there that satisfaction or contentment can ever be realized, when even the highest Dhyan Chohan "can but bow in ignorance before the awful mystery of Absolute Being."

Is it strange, or natural, that statements of similar nature in the *Secret Doctrine* have the effect of creating hopelessness, of bringing a person to question the value and outcome of his strivings, and of causing him to ponder the meaning of progress? What advantage has the Chohan over the clodhopper, if the position of each is that of relative ignorance? What right has one to suppose that after many lifetimes of struggle, after untold ages of trial and suffering, the relative knowledge achieved will bring the pilgrim any sense of progress or advance? Like the despondent Arjuna in the early chapters of the *Bhagavad Gita,* one is inclined to say: "I shall not fight, O Govinda."

However reasonable, from the human point of view, the above arguments may appear, it is clear that their logic is purely that of lower mind. As long as one thinks of himself as separate from the Absolute, of his existence as being outside the Eternal, and of progress solely in terms of achievement, realization will never be attained. But the first lesson of the *Secret Doctrine* is that man is *not* separate from the Absolute; he is identical with It. The *Secret Doctrine* teaches that man's real existence is not broken up into periods of time, as it seems to be, but is of continuous duration, and furthermore that progress is only that of inner realization. In his real nature man is spiritual—not material—and the evolution of his soul is fed by spiritual, not relative, values. It was realization of this truth that marked the advance made by Arjuna in the eleventh

chapter of the *Gita.* Prostrate in ignorance before the terrifying vision of Universal Being, he desired to behold more familiar scenes, and especially to see the "inconceivable Being" assume again a "placid human shape."

There is "comfort" in the thought that the One Reality is the Self, and that there is no other; that the Eternal is *now,* and not somewhere in the distant future; that present conditions and duties are but timely opportunities for learning the nature of the one unchanging Law. Always, the spirit of man shall be a ray of Absolute Being, always the spiritual man shall live in the eternal Now, and always the same great lessons of life are contained in the experiences we meet, no matter how varied those experiences may be. Timelessly, the great lessons of life await our mastery.

Why, then, should one wish to be something else, when he is, in reality, not separate from the Absolute, the One Life? Why should he become impatient or desire to hurry, when at this very moment he is as near to the end of eternity as he will ever be? Why crave for different conditions, when the same fundamental laws of the universe are at work in the smallest as well as in the greatest events? Man's striving for perfection and happiness has perhaps been in the wrong direction. He has acquired the habit of looking outward instead of within, and thus has lost his way in a sea of relativities. By comparing his achievements with those of other men, he grows ambitious and competitive. He wants more land than he can tend, more property than he can care for, more money than he can use, and more head-learning than he has need of in daily life. Some even ask for definitions of the Absolute! But reversing the process and looking within, one finds close at hand the soul-satisfying values of true existence. "Men being contented and devoted to their own proper duties attain perfection."

One of the greatest delusions to which the lower mind is subject is that which causes men to think of progress and perfection in terms of relative rather than of spiritual values, to think that because something is big and spectacular, it is more worthy than the commonplace. The perfection of the sphere does not depend upon its volume, but upon its balance and proportion. Nor is the spiritual stature of man measured by intellectual achievement or position, but by his manner of living.

The man of divine proportion is one who is centered in the Self, and has found his place in relation to all other selves. Patient of time and events, uncomplaining of his lot, he cheerfully performs each and every duty as it comes. Why is it so difficult to find this center, do we ask? What is it that destroys the balance and harmony in man's life? It is desire, anger and covetousness, according to Krishna. It is the threads of like and dislike that warp the proportions of the soul.

The splendor of the inner Self sheds its light only through the vortices of heart, not through the convolutions of brain. We do not need high learning to be honest, nor noted achievement to be generous and kind. If we are unable *now* to practice virtue, which alone brings true happiness, there is no reason to believe it will be easier in the future. If we are incapable of finding peace and contentment in present circumstances, and at our present level of development, we only deceive ourselves with the thought that we can do so under different conditions, as for example, in the state of the "Dhyan Chohan." The fact is that Chohanship can never be reached except a basis in ethics comes first. Heart-light must precede growth in knowledge. Contentment must precede expansion from within. It is only when one assumes the position of willingness to remain just where he is for a million lives, if necessary, that harmonious unfoldment can begin. Why, then, do we put off devotion? Why wait for the future, and thus deprive ourselves of the warmth and beneficence of the Eternal, when, all the while, the ever-present Now is so near at hand?

The atom in its place and the Dhyan Chohan in his are both necessary parts of the One Whole. The Chohan, 'tis true, may be ignorant before the mystery of Absolute Being, but there is no evidence that such a being is ignorant in its *own sphere,* or lacks knowledge appropriate and necessary to its function. Nor is there ever a reason for any man to be destitute of clear-seeing, proper direction, or understanding—no matter on which rung of the ladder he may stand. One who is devoted to present duty, and desires only what is necessary, will always have knowledge equal to any event that may arise. As to the mystery of Absolute Being: "What, O Arjuna, hast thou to do with so much knowledge as this?"

"THE GITA"—INFORMAL ESSAYS

On Everyday Questions

THE Arjuna who meets Krishna on the battlefield suffers from one weakness greater than all others—the Achilles heel of despair. What is despair? A study of philosophy encourages one to seek many definitions by contrast, and thus we might ask ourselves another question at the same time: What is the opposite of despair, since all tendencies or qualities are supposed to alternate with their opposing extremes? Emotional elation is the misguided conviction that we have achieved, or are achieving, more than is actually the case. Despair is the misguided conviction that we have achieved less than our actual accomplishments indicate. The man who struggles through a heavy surf to shore will know of "alternations" which provide an exact physical counterpart for such a psychological cycle. A swell of water will suddenly thrust a swimmer twenty feet closer to his destination. He will feel strong and masterful as accelerated progress is felt by his driving body—but when the water returns from its onward rush towards the shore-line his greatest efforts will not prevent his loss of all that was gained *save that won by his own efforts,* independent of the previously auspicious current.

Our actual position is not in space and time, for we all alternately ride forward on, or are pulled back by, the cyclic recurrence of the waves of emotion. Our position is not, we can come to see, dependent upon these waves at all, but upon the amount of progress we can make in relation to the *whole* ocean, not just to its moving surface. The man who allows himself to be unduly elated relaxes his energy; his body and mind cease to function in the rigorous harmony he had meant to compel. If he despairs at seeing his over-estimated gains eliminated, he similarly relaxes his vigilance. And it is eternal vigilance in the battle of life which makes the Kshatriya quality of such tremendous importance. It is this quality that Arjuna must first attain before he can hope to have enough steadfastness of purpose to regain his lost kingdom.

In the second chapter of the *Gita,* we find interesting commentary on a claim of many theosophists—that a universal belief in reincarnation and karma would speedily bring about the moral regeneration of humanity. It appears from what Krishna says, on the contrary, that the least commendable of persons may yet consider "Reincarnation and Karma" as principal articles of their faith:

> The unwise, delighting in the controversies of the Vedas, tainted with worldly lusts . . . pronounce, for the attainment of worldly riches and enjoyments, flowery sentences which promise rewards in future births for present action, ordaining also many special ceremonies the fruit of which is merit leading to power and objects of enjoyment. But those who thus desire riches and enjoyment have no certainty of soul and least hold on meditation.

In other words, it is entirely possible for believers in reincarnation to cherish that belief principally because they wish to extend their involvement in the area of the senses beyond the gap of death. We must learn, though, that no belief can ever quite be a static thing. Any idea about reincarnation will either work upon the manasic nature of its professor in such a way as to ever widen its implications, or else the implications of rebirth will seem fewer and fewer until it remains only as a symbol of unfulfilled wishes. If a man reaches this latter point, he is a logical candidate for forgetting about reincarnation entirely or accepting some belief such as that of the conventional Christian heaven. Any one who concentrates upon a sensual life will slowly materialize his nature to the point where his imagination will have no focus for anything beyond the physical realms. Thus overburdened by the impulses of matter, he cannot possibly see beyond one life. Perhaps many of those described by Krishna as the "unwise" were the forerunners of later sensual materialists who pride themselves on their disbelief in any future life.

This leads us to recognize, does it not, that no "idea" can suddenly transform the nature of man. The noblest ethic can merely suggest a different way of conduct to the man who hears its formulation. His actual behavior patterns may remain unaltered for days, months, years or lifetimes. But, sooner or later, it can be expected that he will either lose the idea entirely or, instead, if he is diligent in meditating upon it, he can satisfactorily change his habitual patterns of behavior.

Of the many worthy philosophers who have defended Plato's tenet that "ideas rule the world," there are probably few who have not, at times, recognized that this Platonic belief must not be oversimplified. We are constantly presented with anomalies in the form of persons who seriously profess an ethic which seems to have little or nothing to do with their behavior. We are all familiar with religious hypocrisy, which means to us that a great many Christians have professed belief in the superiority of gentleness, kindness, and self-sacrifice over passion, hate, and a desire to subject others to the dominance of their own superiority—yet what has been called the Christian world is, manifestly, the most viciously competitive world, both economically and politically, that is presently known to history.

Another interesting sort of anomaly is presented by the man who preaches the law of the jungle and lives like a saint. Innumerable "materialists" deny anything except biological significance to man, and yet live strictly according to a code completely at variance with the ethics implied by the "survival of the fittest." So we can see that the real man is not any collection of ideas he may be presently entertaining, but rather the habits of character which predispose him to being brutal or kind, loving or hateful, fearful or courageous, under the pressure of difficult circumstances. Still, it does not follow from this that ideas *do not* rule the world, for all of these "character attributes" are, in Theosophical terms, crystallized thoughts. Once upon a time, each habit had its origin in a conception of what would be the most intelligent or logical or satisfactory way to act. Years —or reincarnations later—the suggestive power of the ideas bears fruit, and their character is more plainly seen.

Today, as in Krishna's time, it may be that the most materialistic of men show the greatest concern in an after-life, and the men of spiritual determination—whether they be statesmen and educators like Gandhi, or physicists and educators like Einstein—are obviously concerned very little with what happens to them after death. Of such Krishna says, "those who are united to knowledge and devoted, and who have renounced all reward for their actions, meet no rebirth in this life and go to that eternal blissful abode which is free from all disease and untouched by troubles." It would seem that one's interest in securing a guarantee of a future life on earth is proportionate to his lack of internal security. Most men desperately need

thought of reincarnation, the doctrine of intelligent hope. But the wisest men probably do not think about reincarnation at all; rather, they think in terms of the continuity of all life, all aspirations, and all spiritual achievement.

We are elsewhere informed that it is possible for the man who reaches the state of Adeptship to pass through the after-death conditions of Kama-loka and Devachan in full consciousness—which means, of course, that these states cease to exist in their usual sense for him. Similarly, the Adept, unlike most of us, will never reach a state of despair; he need not pass through those repetitive cycles of psychological death and rebirth which are so familiar to most of us. Our persistent struggle to maintain continuity of motivation and will is undoubtedly the greatest tribute we can pay to the philosophy of reincarnation.

So it should be obvious that we cannot classify human beings morally according to their present professed beliefs. The Theosophist is devoted to the preservation of the current of philosophy. He can judge the qualities of that philosophy in comparison with others, but he cannot judge the moral value of persons according to their theoretical affiliations. This, we might say, is the central root of the necessity for impersonality in all attempts to promulgate Theosophical doctrines. No affiliations between Theosophists are of any extra value because the name Theosophy is accepted as a common denominator. The real common denominator shows itself in habits of action deeply ingrained in men, though the ideas may provide an extension of the capacity for sharing and understanding which makes group creativity possible.

It is the common lot of a humanity in which soul-mind is not yet fully incarnated to undergo innumerable "rebirths in this life," and for those who have set their hearts upon a *particular* result to suffer the interruption to learning and concentration whenever an alteration in events occurs. Man must escape from the endless cycles of psychological death and rebirth in this life before he is *ready* to move into a realm where truth, goodness and beauty cease to be represented by static forms and flow as steady currents in the river of evolution.

COMMUNICATIONS

[In response to the invitation in the January issue, several comments (of varying length) have been received, addressed to the subject of Man's Free Will. More discussion will be welcome, contributors finding the specifications for "copy" inside the front cover. We present herewith the further reflections of a reader on Free Will.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

FREE WILL—OR FREE CHOICE?

IT appears a difficult undertaking to define and delimit the area in which free will manifests. WILL being the "energy of the mind," if this energy is aroused and set in motion by some past cause, instead of being a novel event, self-generated by the mind, I suppose it would be denied the designation "free will." Would it be correct to say that, according to the teachings as given to us by H.P.B. and W.Q.J., the chain of karmic causes was initiated by an act of free-will? Regarding the aspect of karma we are considering—do beings who have not yet reached the self-reflective state generate karma? Did THOSE who refused to incarnate in the "mindless" men exercise free will?

Now, to consider current acts. If one is struck a blow by another, without any apparent reason, and one's first impulse is to strike back savagely, but this impulse is controlled and suppressed: if this act of control was due to teachings such as "turn the other cheek," "a soft answer turneth away wrath," or "An anchorite does not go about striking people," the orthodox religionist would probably cite it as an instance of free-will; the behaviorist would refer to it as a "conditioned reflex" that exceeded in strength the first impulse—a "stimulus response." A theosophist might consider it a karmic response rather than an act of free-will.

Confusion for the behaviorist results from the apparent fact that, to a certain point, his description of mental processes corresponds with that of the theosophist: What the teacher discloses to his pupil, conditions the pupil's choice—but that is the "point" where the behaviorist parts company with the theosophist. The behaviorist insists he is dealing with a machine. If he is completely sold on the idea of a machine, I suppose it would be impossible to condition him to

see otherwise, though this "impossibility" might cast some doubt on his theory.

If my memory of the teachings is not at fault: some of the karma we generate is the result of motive and intent, while some is the result of carelessness or negligence regarding certain responsibilities. In either case, the karma is sent upon its way to find us out at some future time, possibly in the form of a weak or deranged mind, blindness, or a broken body. But—it would seem that these things come upon us from outside, like hail-stones, and do not eliminate the possibility of free will under their impact. I would say that if, when our karmic debts fall due, we accept the bills and pay off gracefully and with proper spirit, they are finished and cancelled and we are done with them. There is little here to militate against free will.

In this January THEOSOPHY, the article "The Original Programme," contains the expression " 'Mahatma'-Dugpas." In H.P.B.'s *Glossary,* the term *Dugpa* is called a synonym for "adept of black magic." My understanding of these terms is that they refer to the same thing and that the individual to whom the terms apply is not a fallen Mahatma, but rather one who chose to perfect himself in black magic. Of course, both H.P.B. and W.Q.J. state that one may attain to very high development and then fall to the foot of the ladder, or worse. But, if this course was not the result of choice, present or past,—an act of free-will—then our situation appears rather desperate.

The consideration of Mahatmas was due to the question in "Man's Free Will": "How can anyone in incarnation, Mahatma or otherwise, be free of the past?" In the *Glossary* is given:

> *Mahatma.* Lit., "great soul." An adept of the highest order. Exalted beings who, having attained to the mastery over their lower principles are thus living unimpeded by the "man of flesh," and are in possession of knowledge and power commensurate with the stage they have reached in their spiritual evolution.

"Unimpeded by the man of flesh," would seem to indicate that karma due to the "man of flesh" had been worked out, or cancelled out. To this extent, then, a Mahatma is freed of karma. He still generates karma and is subject to its effects, on a plane and under conditions unknown to the uninitiated. However, it still is not apparent that karma eliminates free will or, except by temporary

crippling, delimits its exercise. Karma is the *Law* under which all things manifest, as all things on the earth are, also, subject to the law of gravity. In scaling a mountain, gravity makes our progress slow and wearing, but—it *is* the condition under which we function here.

The writer of "Man's Free Will" speaks of karmic effects as constituting ". . . a tremendous . . . impediment." Well, the duration of a manvantara is "tremendous." If our progress was much more rapid, I suppose the duration of a manvantara would not be so great. I am tempted to think of:

> "Ah, Love! Could you and I with Fate conspire
> To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
> Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
> Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire!"

To the question: "If all start the cycle of evolution as equals. . . , why should one fail and the other succeed?"—the only answer that occurs to me at this moment is, because we have free will. If we were machines, I suppose we would all "fail" or all "succeed" together.

Regarding the statement: ". . . and plan would go out the window." I never understood that "plan" in the sense of a coercive arrangement applied to the "pilgrim soul." Plan applies to the stage upon which the "pilgrim soul" appeared. There were paths that he could take, but he was not forced to travel only one.

Referring again to the conception of karma as "a tremendous impediment,"—it would appear to be a tremendous help, also. In the *Ocean,* page 89, W.Q.J. states that karma is "equally the means of escape from incarnation."

Here is an idea that has just asked for attention: If "will" is the "energy of the mind" possessed in greater or less degree by all, and if it be true that "behind *Will* stands *Desire*"—could it be that "free choice" and "free will" are not the same thing? That when we have spoken of free will we meant free choice, and that "free" should not be connected with "will" at all? If "will" is the "energy of the mind," "free will" would seem to imply an energy that directs itself. And if desire stands behind will—this would seem to indicate that it does not direct itself. It seems that behind "will" must be a chooser and possessor of desire who sets this "energy of the mind" in motion.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK—

As a person climbs higher up the evolutionary ladder, it would seem that with more soul knowledge the struggle would be easier. Why, then, is it often just the opposite?

Why should we expect the struggle to get easier? The higher one climbs on a great mountain, the more difficult it gets, and in what way is our path of evolution any different? First, it may be, there is the pleasant trail through cool forests, gradually drawing us onward to where the forest thins out and the sun beats down on fewer trees and more rocks, and a steeper path. Finally, we will, if we persist, come to the point where there is no trail at all before us, only bleak crags on which we must find our own perilous footholds. And all the time the air is becoming thinner and rarer, making breathing difficult.

And even were it so, that the more advanced we are, the easier our task becomes—even so, would it not be best for us to be unaware of that fact? For if we go about constantly expecting our burden to become lighter, our very anticipation of future ease makes our present labor heavier. Perhaps, too, we are thinking in terms of the world's view of a man's life. The ordinary conception is that for the first part of a man's life, ever more complicated studies make his task progressively harder, until the happy day of release comes. Then, when he graduates from high school or from college, he can consider studying a thing of the past, an obstacle surmounted and a task finished. He gets a job and "settles down," and slides comfortably through the rest of his life, exerting himself only enough to insure an adequate income to meet his needs and responsibilities.

Such a superficial view of things has nothing to do with the realities of evolution. Rather, we must be prepared to "find our pleasure in endless work for Humanity," as Mr. Judge put it. The purpose of our growth is not that we may eventually be able to slough off all burdens (choosing the Nirvana of spiritual selfishness), but that we may develop more strength that will enable us to help others with their burdens. This latter process suggests that somewhere along the line our personal burdens—our defects, deceits, and selfishness—will be lightened as a result of strenuous efforts,

but greater labors will take their place. So in a sense the struggle *within ourselves* will become easier as we persist, though work for others will increase with our capacity. H.P.B. was fond of quoting from Christina Rossetti's poem:

> Does the road wind up-hill all the way?
> Yes, to the very end.
> Does the journey take the whole long day?
> From morn to night, my friend.

The teachings speak of the fact that, at the death of the body, annihilation of the personal ego results when it is not influenced by the spirit. Is this the reason we do not remember our past lives?

We would hardly say that this is the reason, for, it is taught, all except the most selfish materialist present *some* harvest to Buddhi at the end of an incarnation, though rarely does a person remember his past life. So, regardless of whether or not the personality is annihilated, the memory of past experiences *as experiences* becomes buried when the soul takes up a new body and personality. H. P. Blavatsky uses, in her *Key to Theosophy,* the analogy of an actor playing many parts in the course of a lifetime, and assimilates the reincarnating soul to the actor. Following out this analogy, can we not see that the soul would be defeating its own purposes were it to be aware in one life of the activities of the last, just as an actor would botch his part as Prospero if he allowed his mind to dwell on the memory of himself as Macbeth.

That memory, however, exists continually for the actor himself, though for the purposes of his work he temporarily blots it out. At the end of his life, for instance, he will reminisce, will bring to life again all the parts he has acted out, will perhaps compare them one to the other, and realize within himself which he performed creditably, and which he failed to bring to life. And he will sum up, we may think, the separate values contributed by each role, how each identification with those illusionary characters brought home to him a new lesson. This must be what the soul does, reviewing a long series of lives, all the important events and lessons of which have been preserved as soul memory, though the separate brains and personalities recording those events have long been dissolved. For an excellent treatment of this question, read "Indian Days," a series

of three articles in dialogue form by H.P.B. which were reprinted in THEOSOPHY, Volume xxxv, July, August and September.

What is the best way to help a person who wants praise, since giving it seems to hinder him more than withholding it? On the other hand, he is sometimes offended and thinks we are not appreciative. In this case, the person has had no contact with Theosophy.

Well, we can start right there, and see that he *does* have some contact with Theosophy—with the ideas of the soul and of its evolution, of karma, for a beginning. These doctrines open up our minds to a wider field, in which praise—or blame, for that matter—is reduced in size and importance.

Fundamentally, a person who is preoccupied with the praise or blame he receives (or doesn't receive) from other people must be unsure of himself. Otherwise it would be sufficient for him to pass his own judgment on his actions, and he would care little as to what others might find in them to praise or to deplore.

Under these circumstances, it would seem that the best thing to do with a person who is looking for praise is not simply to *withhold* it, but to banish it utterly from the field of our relations. Both praise and blame as personal reactions, cannot, really, ever be justified. If praising someone means we assert our right to confer approbation, or consider ourselves his judge, this is unwarranted. If praise is just another way of telling him that past efforts entitle him to a rest, this is fallacious. We need *encouragement,* not praise. We need help in gathering our forces for future effort, not praise for what is done. Krishna didn't praise Arjuna when the latter had enunciated all the noble reasons which kept him from fulfilling his duty on the battlefield. He told him, instead, to abandon *his weakness* and fight. Among the reminiscences of Mr. Judge printed in the 1946 edition of his *Letters* is the suggestive remark that there were many who would rather have been scolded and corrected by Mr. Judge than praised by anyone else. Apparently, in Judge, his associates found one who had not the slightest tendency to do injustice, and whose corrections, therefore, were more inspiring than the partisan compliments of lesser men.

THE ORIGINAL PROGRAMME

By H.P.B.

III

THE undersigned is an ever patient theosophist, who has hitherto laboured under the impression that no amount of subtle scholasticism and tortured casuistry but would find like the Rosetta stone its Champollion—some day. The most acute among theosophists are now invited to make out in "A Few Words"—what the writers or writer—is driving at—unless in plain and unvarnished language, it be—"Down with the Theosophical Society, President-Founder and its Head-Quarters!" This is the only possible explanation of the twelve pages of denunciations to which a reply is now attempted. What can indeed be made out of the following jumble of contradictory statements:—

(a) The President Founder having been shown throughout as a "tyrant," a "*would be* Caesar," "aiming at *papal power*" and a "Venetian Council of Three," and other words to that effect implied in almost every sentence of the paper under review, it is confessed in the same breath that the "London Lodge" of the Theosophical Society has *completely ignored* the *Rules* (of the Pope Caesar) published at Adyar! (p. 4) And yet, the "L.L. of the T.S." still lives and breathes and one has heard of no *anathema* pronounced against it, so far. . . .

(b) Rule XIV stating that the Society has "to deal *only* with scientific and philosophical subjects," hence, "it is quite *evident* [?] that the power and position claimed in the *Rules* for the P't Founder and the Gen. Council and Convention are opposed to the spirit of the declared Objects."

It might have been as well perhaps to quote the entire paragraph in which these words appear,* once that hairs are split about the

NOTE.—This article was first printed in *The Theosophist,* August, 1924.

*"XIV. The Society having to deal only with scientific and philosophical subjects, and having Branches in different parts of the world under various forms of Government, does not permit its members, as such, to interfere with politics, and repudiates any attempt on the part of any one to commit it in favor or against any political party or measure. Violation of this rule will meet with expulsion."

This rather alters the complexion put on the charge, which seems to conveniently forget that "scientific and philosophical subjects" are not the *only* declared objects of the Society. Let us not leave room for a doubt that there is more *animus* underlying the charges than would be strictly *theosophical.*

possibly faulty reaction of the *Rules?* Is it not self-evident, that the words brought forward "only with scientific and philosophical subjects" are inserted as a necessary caution to *true* theosophists, who by dealing with politics *within* any Branch Society might bring disgrace and ruin on the whole body,—in India to begin with? Has the Society or has it not over 140 Societies scattered through four parts of the world to take care of? As in the case of "Mahatmas" and "Mahatmaship"—active work of the Theosophical Society is confused—willingly or otherwise, it is not for the writer to decide —with Theosophy. No need of entering here upon the difference between the jar that contains a liquid and the nature of, or that liquid itself.

"Theosophy teaches *self-culture* . . . and not control," we are told. Theosophy teaches *mutual-culture* before *self*-culture to *begin* with. Union is strength. It is by gathering many theosophists of the same way of thinking into one or more groups, and making them closely united by the same magnetic bond of fraternal unity and sympathy that the objects of *mutual* development and progress in Theosophical thought may be best achieved. "Self-culture" is for isolated *Hatha Yogis,* independent of any Society and having to avoid association with human beings; and this is a *triply distilled* SELFISHNESS. For real moral advancement—there "where two or three are gathered" in the name of the SPIRIT OF TRUTH—there that Spirit or Theosophy *will be in the midst of them.*

To say that theosophy has no need of a Society—a vehicle and centre thereof,—is like affirming that the Wisdom of the Ages collected in thousands of volumes, at the British Museum has no need of either the edifice that contains it, nor the works in which it is found. Why not advise the British Gov't on its lack of discrimination and its *worldliness* in not destroying Museum and all its vehicles of Wisdom? Why spend such sums of money and pay so many officers to watch over its treasures, the more so, since many of its guardians may be quite out of keeping with, and opposed to the Spirit of that Wisdom? The Directors of such Museums may or may not be very perfect men, and some of their assistants may have never opened a philosophical work: yet, it is they who take care of the library and preserve it for future generations who are indirectly entitled to their thanks. How much more gratitude is due to those

who like our self-sacrificing theosophists at Adyar, devote their lives to, and give their services gratuitously to the good of Humanity!

Diplomas and Charters are objected to, and chiefly the "admission fee." The latter is a "taxation," and therefore "*inconsistent* with the principle of Brotherhood" . . . . A "forced gift is *unbrotherly,*" etc., etc. It would be curious to see where the T. S. would be led to, were the P't. F. to religiously follow the proffered advices. "Initiation" on admission, has been made away with already in Europe, and has *led to that* which will very soon become known; no use mentioning it at present. Now the "Charters" and Diplomas would follow. Hence no document to show for any group, and no diploma to prove that one is affiliated to the Society. Hence also perfect liberty to any one to either call himself a theosophist, or deny he is one. The "admission fee"? Indeed, it has to be regarded as a terrible and *unbrotherly* "extortion," and a "forced gift," in the face of those thousands of Masonic Lodges, of Clubs, Associations, Societies, Leagues, and even the "Salvation Army." The former, extort yearly *fortunes* from their Members; the latter—throttle in the name of Jesus the masses and appealing to *voluntary* contributions make the converts pay, and pay in their turn every one of their "officers," none of whom will serve the "Army" for nothing.

Yet it would be well, perchance, were our members to follow the example of the Masons in their solidarity of thought and action and at least *outward* Union, notwithstanding that receiving a thousand times more from their members they give them in return still less than we do, whether spiritually or morally. This solitary single guinea expected from every new member is spent in less than one week, as was calculated, on postage and correspondence with theosophists. Or are we to understand that all correspondence with members—now left to "self-culture"—is also to cease and has to follow diplomas, Charters and the rest? Then, truly, the Head Quarters and Office had better be closed. A simple *Query*—however: Have the 1£—the yearly contribution to the L.L. of the T.S., and the further sum of 2/6d. to the Oriental Group been abolished as "acts of unbrotherly extortion," and how long, if so, have they begun to be regarded as "a *sale* of Brotherhood"?

(To be continued.)

EXTENSIONS OF EVIDENCE

Trans-solar Space and Nebulae

NEARLY a hundred years ago, the great German scientist, Alexander von Humboldt, suggested that trans-solar space did not show any phenomenon analogous to our solar system. He is quoted as writing in the *Revue Germanique* of December 31, 1860: "It is a peculiarity of our System, that matter should have condensed within it in nebulous rings, the nuclei of which condense into earths and moons. I say again, heretofore nothing of the kind has ever been observed beyond our planetary system" (*S.D.* I, 497 fn.). Nonetheless, and notwithstanding H. P. Blavatsky's affirmation of the view that "no *earths* or *moons* can be found *except in appearance*—beyond, or of the same order of matter as found in our system," astronomers infer from the observed concentration in the Milky Way, that here on earth we are situate inside a great disk-shaped system of stars, and controversy has raged for many years about the nature of certain types of nebulae. Mr. Fred Hoyle tells us in *The Listener* (London, April 7, 1949) that as against the theory that these nebulae were small patches of gas within our own galaxy, American astronomers have found that they are independent stellar systems having dimensions comparable with those of the Milky Way itself.

It is said that the number of independent galaxies within the range of present observation is about 100,000,000 and that light takes about one thousand million years to come from the most distant galaxies visible in the larger telescopes. Mr. Hoyle goes on to say:

> Where have these galaxies come from? It now seems fairly certain that they have condensed out of a uniform background of diffuse gaseous material. Is this background exhausted? Or can new galaxies still condense out of it? I think there is little doubt that the background is very far from being exhausted. On a fair estimate only about one part in a thousand has been used up to form the galaxies. It is therefore to be expected that new condensations are continually being formed out of it.

This background material is thought of as being distributed throughout the whole of space, and observation shows that the galaxies themselves are moving away from each other at enormous speed, "which for the most distant galaxies becomes comparable with the speed of light itself." This expanding universe is determined in much the same manner as a whistle from an approaching train is noticed to possess a higher pitch, and from a disappearing train a lower pitch, than a similar whistle from a stationary train:

> Light emitted by a moving object has the same property. In particular the pitch of the light is lowered, or as we say reddened, if the object is receding from us. Now we observe that light from the galaxies is reddened, and the degree of reddening increases proportionately with the distance of a galaxy. The natural explanation of this is that the galaxies are rushing away from each other at enormous speeds. . . .

How does the discovery that the space in which galaxies are confined expands into time affect theories about the "creation" of matter in the universe? Earlier hypotheses assumed that this matter was created at a particular time in the remote past. Mr. Hoyle suggests that all such theories conflict with the new observational requirements, and that we are now faced with the conception of matter being created continuously. It was supposed that there was a decrease of background density as we went forward into the future, and an increase as we go back into the past. It is not the case, however, that galaxies formed in the remote past have average densities greater than the density of the existing background; all the galaxies are observed to have mean densities not greatly in excess of the present background. On this basis, continuous creation "takes place in such a way that the background density remains constant with time." The groundwork of this theory (Mr. Hoyle says) was prepared by H. Weyl, a German mathematician now living in the United States.

Mr. Hoyle states that the results of a good deal of mathematical work would appear to show that both the age of the universe and the volume of space are infinite:

> Both Eddington and Jeans were concerned with model universes of finite age and volume, and containing a fixed amount of matter. This led Jeans, on the basis of a thermodynamic argument, to pro-

> claim that the ultimate fate of the universe was a featureless heat death. Every physical process was supposed to hasten this end. But the type of argument used by Jeans becomes invalid when applied to a universe with continuous creation of matter. The creation of new material prevents thermodynamic degeneration, and there is no running down at all. In other words the universe remains permanently wound up. Eddington, on the other hand, was much impressed by a certain coincidence between a number that arose out of his theory of the expanding universe and a number obtained from atomic physics. One of the reasons why I am favourably disposed towards the creation theory is that this coincidence now appears as a relation between the rate of creation of matter and a number derived from atomic theory.

We doubt if wisdom will arise from the welter of theories until science turns its attention to the despised esotericism of the ancients. There is no guarantee that future observations or deductions will not upset the latest theories of continuous creation. "To become complete and comprehensible," wrote H. P. Blavatsky, "a cosmogonical theory has to start with a primordial Substance diffused throughout boundless Space, *of an intellectual and divine nature*" (*S.D.* I, 594). Further, the occult teaching says:

> *Nothing is created, but is only transformed.* Nothing can manifest itself in this universe—from a globe down to a vague, rapid thought—that was not in the universe already; everything on the subjective plane is an eternal is; as everything on the objective plane is an *ever becoming*—because transitory.

Even the usual nebular hypothesis was anticipated by Anaximenes, the Greek rhetorician of the 6th century B.C., who taught "that the sidereal bodies were formed through the progressive condensation of a primordial pregenetic matter, which had almost a negative weight, and was spread out through Space in an extremely sublimated condition" (*S.D.* I, 590). Add to these thoughts a fundamental law in Occultism, "that there is no rest or cessation of motion in Nature," and the incessant theories and speculations of today will be seen to differ greatly even from the incomplete but faithful systems of Kant and Laplace, themselves "a short chapter out of the large volume of universal esoteric cosmogony" (*S.D.* I, 597).

OPEN SESAME!

THE door of the higher life opens to a magic formula. Should the wayfarer tug at it, hammer on it, or try to force it, the entrance will remain sealed tight, an impregnable barrier. But let him stand silently at the threshold with the formula in his heart and the door will swing wide without the slightest touch! The path leading to it is well-beaten with footprints, but at the entrance, many of them stop. Some branch to the right, perhaps to explore, some to the left, and many turn to try to go back, mute evidence that the door has refused to open. But has it?

Unbelievable as it may seem, the secret is given to everyone who searches life. How it is given is a mystery to the superficial, but over and over again life reveals the one sure formula, in a multitude of ways, alike to those who fail temporarily and to those who succeed. Perhaps the directions have seemed too simple to be deep, too obvious to be occult, too commonplace to open the door of the abode of the gods. Mankind knows the directions by heart, but not *of* the heart.

"The trinity of nature is the lock of magic, the trinity of man the key that fits it." This is no mysterious statement, when one reflects that everything is alive on all planes of being for a purpose: to improve and perfect, either self-impulsively or self-consciously. Humanity has the leading role in the upward surge of evolution, and this role is *work*—physical, mental, and spiritual.

In work, therefore, lies the secret of success, but it is work with a distinctive quality. One must ride full tilt against old habits of doing passively what comes along. He must attack in full force the tendency to personal covetousness. It is labor performed just as obediently or resolutely as before, but with a special quality that flows from the Divine Self within. This is the magic formula: Self-induced and Self-devised effort.

Sometimes it is whispered about by baffled seekers that there must be a side entrance to the higher life. A select few, it is insidiously suggested, are shown the way, while the rest of the seekers plod

along the ordinary pathway meeting all the obstacles. Malicious gossip! Listen to the words of the Teachers: "No honest searcher comes back empty handed" . . . "the great ones as well as the small have trodden the royal road to knowledge" . . . "there may be no human creature living at this moment, of whom it can be said that the highest possibilities of nature are impossible of attainment."

A few suggestions may help the pilgrim find his way and so become the shining embodiment of self-induced and self-devised effort. At the beginning of conscious work a detailed investigation of oneself must be undertaken. Just as Polaris, the polestar, is sought by the astronomer, so the pilgrim must seek the stationary point around which his heaven rotates. What habits make it shine brighter are to be carefully cultivated; whatever habits becloud its light are to be discarded. And the true seeker must admit there is rubbish to be discarded.

Next, the qualities of fearlessness, harmlessness, sincerity, assiduity of devotion, and all the other virtues set forth in the *Bhagavad-Gita* should be given attention. Each of these is a specific suggestion in itself for Self-induced and Self-devised effort. Abilities along certain lines may be striven for, provided caution is exercised and provided they are cultivated to serve the Higher Self and not to gain personal advancement. Everything done must serve the behests of the Inner Man.

The higher life is not a super-psychic state that comes over one like a spell of enchantment. Plainly put, it is striving to do good—this very instant and every instant hereafter. Neither is the higher life a lonely-hearts-club for individuals who seek escape from the frustrations of life. It is to "lean back and look on at the ebb and flow that washes to our feet and away again many things that are not easy to lose nor pleasant to welcome." The higher life is no permanent vacation from responsibilities. It is self-assumption of responsibilities, and devotion fixed immovably upon the Self within, the Self in all.

The door swings wide without the slightest touch!

ON THE LOOKOUT

Delusions or Facts?

In a review article by Dr. Jule Eisenbud on "Psychiatric Contributions to Parapsychology" (*Journal of Parapsychology,* December, 1949) occurs a statement of particular interest to theosophists. Dr. Eisenbud, in summarizing the views of Ehrenwald, "the psychiatrist who has concerned himself most with the theoretical aspects of telepathy," remarks that the latter,—

> addressing himself to the question of the schizophrenic psychoses, . . . suggests that paranoid psychotics may be unable to differentiate in consciousness the material arising from their own psychological metabolism (autopsychic sources) and from ideas, emotions, etc., coming from outside (heteropsychic sources), and that paranoid delusions may actually have a basis in telepathically perceived fact.

Freely translating this from the scientific jargon into terms intelligible to the layman, we may say that Dr. Ehrenwald is here tentatively approaching the idea that psychic experiences arising subjectively—entering the consciousness, say, directly from the astral plane—may be fully as "real" under some circumstances, as what we call actual (that is, physical or objective) happenings. This means, of course, that there may be more than superstition to the question of obsession, possession, and related phenomena. Dr. Eisenbud remarks in a footnote that L. J. Bendit, in his book, *Paranormal Cognition,* has discussed this possibility in the neuroses of "unbidden invasions of anxiety from outside sources." Bendit claims that making the patients aware of this possibility is in itself a considerable therapeutic aid.

"A Shutting-Out Process"?

Reasoning from the premise that "paranoid delusions may have a basis in *telepathically perceived fact,*" Ehrenwald argues that certain stuporous conditions (with cataleptic or epileptic symptoms, for instance) may represent a complete shutting-out process, a protective action on the part of the man whose barriers against the invasion of anxiety-provoking influences from the outside would otherwise be "too weak and ineffectual for normal mental functioning." This is to suggest that even such grave organic disorders

as epilepsy may be the long-term result of escape mechanisms set in action by the man himself. The theosophical perspective of reincarnation is necessary, ultimately, to complete this circle of causes and explain the cases of those who have exhibited these abnormal symptoms from early childhood.

It is not at all surprising to hear that Dr. Ehrenwald's speculations have met with some criticism from his fellow-workers in the field. "As for his speculations on the role of psi [paranormal psychic factors] in the schizophrenic psychoses," Dr. Eisenbud declares, "it has been generally held that the meagre evidence at hand does not warrant such conclusions." If the science of parapsychology continues in its present progressive attitude, it may not be too long before the evidence accumulates to support Ehrenwald's "speculations," leading, perhaps, incidentally, to an illumination of certain phases of hypnotic practice. For there would seem to be distinct parallels—perhaps an identity?—between the state of paranoid schizophrenia and that of auto-hypnosis and hypnosis generally.

"Induced Schizophrenia"

Mr. Judge treats of hypnosis suggestively in this regard in his article, "Hypnotism and Theosophy" (Theosophy xxvii, 58). Referring to certain hypnotic experiments by one "Dr. James" (presumably William James), which apparently caused the subject to act as two distinct people—can this not be called *induced schizophrenia?*—Mr. Judge points out that "the apparently distinct division or separation of intelligence in a single human subject are all explained by the ancient eastern method of reducing the inner powers of man into seven classes, in each of which the hidden self—the *Ego*—can and does act independently, the body being only a gross instrument or field for the action of the real man."

> This theory [Mr. Judge continues] divides him into seven planes of action, in each of which the *Ego* or hidden self can have a consciousness operating in a manner peculiarly appropriate to that plane, and also partaking of the consciousness and experience of the planes above it but not below. And each of these layers or fields for consciousness is further divided into other sub-fields, in every one of which there may be a separate experience and action, or all may be combined. Now in the cases taken up by Dr. James, the peculiarity noted was that when the subject acted as No. 1,

> she had no recollection of a state called No. 2. No explanation of this was offered, only the fact being recorded. It is explained by the localization of the consciousness of the *Ego* in one or the other of the sub-fields of action of the first of the . . . seven.
>
> The failure to recollect from one to the other was due to the fact that the *Ego* was forced into that particular field, and was thus unable to carry recollection with it. Hence it was entirely automatic in its action on that plane. This effect was due almost entirely to the specific contractile action of the hypnotic process, which is essentially a contraction of the cells from outside to the centre. This will always prevent the *Ego* from educating itself to remember from state to state and field to field the experience of each. . . .

"RETREAT OF THE EGO"

Similarities between the hypnotic state and that of possession or obsession can easily be found, making it probable that when sufficient evidence has been mustered to support Dr. Ehrenwald's speculations, there will be a more general and lively appreciation of the dangers of hypnosis. Let us accept for a moment the premise that "catatonic stuporous conditions" may represent a shutting-out process by the man to protect him from external influences that would impair his normal mental functioning. Might this not very well be the reaction of the man subjected to hypnosis—a retreat from control by another mind? Another aspect of this problem is opened up by Mr. Judge in the above-mentioned article, when he says:

> The cases where the subject escapes from the operator's control are all explicable under the same theosophic theory; that is, those are instances in which the *Ego* retreats from the first plane or field of consciousness made up of seven divisions or sub-fields to the next one of the whole class of seven, instead of entering one of the sub-divisions of the first. And, as the medical practitioners do not know of nor admit the reality of the higher inner sub-divisions, they are not acquainted with the means for reaching the *Ego* when it has escaped further from them into a field of consciousness where they are in ignorance of causes and conditions. . . .

From this we may conclude that as parapsychologists delve deeper into man's states of consciousness, they will be rewarded with a growing power to deal with many of those abnormal psychotic conditions which at present science is unable to help. And specula-

tions such as Dr. Ehrenwald's, however "unwarrantable on present evidence," are perhaps one means of obtaining such knowledge.

"Second Thoughts" on Hypnosis

Meanwhile, it is encouraging to read in the *Medical Journal* (June 25, 1949) the editorial answer to a question relating to the advisability of hypnotizing immature children in school "shows," etc. "Most certainly," it is stated, "hypnosis should not be allowed outside of the medical profession, and laws are needed, forbidding the use of hypnosis for entertainment purposes":

> The induction of hypnosis itself involves the passivity of the subject, and suggestions given to the subject are similar to those given in a child-parent relationship. The hypnotist therefore becomes a commanding authority, and, *once a person has been hypnotized, he is seldom capable of liberating himself* from this authority [italics ours throughout]. Self growth and the ability to become an independent and assertive person are most effectively achieved in an environment where the person is capable of working out his problem through his own capacities and resources. . . . The mentally healthy person is one who can think for himself and who is not afraid to act in such a way that he not only is efficient, but also gets most enjoyment out of his activity. Thus *anything that might handicap a person from attaining such free will should be prevented.*

Review of Psychosurgery

The practice of frontal lobotomy, which might be called the surgical equivalent of medical hypnosis, is also coming in for some serious evaluation these days. At a meeting of the American Psychological Association, a report compiled by Dr. James W. Watts and Dr. Walter Freeman (the two pioneers in psychosurgery, for the past 12 years), with the assistance of Dr. Mary Robinson, was read. The report, entitled "Personality Changes After Psychosurgery," states that the conclusions are based on a study of 68 prefrontal lobotomy patients described as "probably representative of the 500 or more who have made fair to good recoveries under the Freeman and Watts techniques." In evaluating what has happened to the personalities of these patients, the report declares that "they are freed from the tyranny of their own past and are indifferent to future problems and to the opinion of other people."

AN UNDESIRABLE "OBJECTIVITY"

> Their statements regarding themselves [the surgeons observe] are objective and unconcerned and they seldom give voice to defense mechanisms. . . . Their goals are immediate, not remote. They can recall the past as well as ever, but it has diminished interpretive value for them, and they are no more interested in their own past emotional crises than if they had happened to someone else. . . . (New York *Times,* Sept. 9, 1949.)

Such an "objectivity" leaves much to be desired, as Drs. Freeman and Watts seem to be aware. It is one thing to overcome personality defects, attachments, and so forth; it is another (and degrading) thing to have them removed. Worse, it is not alone the personality which is distorted, but the influence of man's higher powers:

> If the operation is minimal, the chief effects seem to be loss of fantasy, of creative drive, of sensitivity, of sympathetic understanding of others. If the operation is radical, patients are likely to be somewhat gross in their appetites for food and sex, careless and slovenly in appearance and largely impervious to criticism. . . .

LOSS OF "SELF-CONTINUITY"

Though patients may differ individually, the behavior of each patient *is in considerable measure predictable,* the report revealed.

> By degrees we come to feel that there is a characteristic conspicuous by its absence in these people that is common to the rest of us and thus has gone largely unremarked by psychologists. We have come to realize that in our own growing consciousness of the self there develops a feeling of our own duration, of our self-continuity, of being in some sense the persons we were yesterday and will be tomorrow with responsibility for both. . . . Self-continuity implies self-adjustability, the effort to avoid now and in the future the mistakes we are painfully aware we made yesterday.

Whereas in May, 1948, Dr. Freeman was declaring that the transorbital lobotomy operation is "simple, quick and safe" (see Lookout, August, 1948), other considerations now outweigh that of surgical efficiency. To have come (by devious and costly ways) to a realizing sense of the self in man as the primal reality underlying the personality and all superficial traits is an important step, we may think, for these "pioneers in psychosurgery," and this developing theory, coupled with a sense of the conscious unit's responsibility for its past and present, may well revolutionize a young and heretofore rather imprudent branch of medical science.

"RADICAL PSYCHOSURGERY"

Corroborating, in import and specific findings, this report of Drs. Freeman and Watts was a discussion by the Washington, D.C. Psychiatric Society on November 17. The *Newsweek* account (Dec. 12, 1949) is prefaced by a brief historical note:

> Since 1936, when Drs. Antonio Moniz and Almeida Lima of Lisbon first tried this operation on a psychotic patient, more than 2,000 lobotomies have been performed in the United States. In it the frontal-lobe areas of the brain, the seat of apprehension, are disconnected from the rest of the brain centers. Almost instantly the patient's agonizing anxiety is relieved.
>
> In the United States, Drs. J. W. Watts and Walter Freeman of Washington, D.C., were the first to try this drastic treatment, but always as a last resort. Many American neuropsychiatrists have agreed with Watts and Freeman that results are good enough to warrant the use of frontal lobotomy on a large scale for the relief of serious and chronic mental disease. Others have expressed distrust of such radical psychosurgery.

(A previous Lookout item on lobotomy, THEOSOPHY xxx, 377, contains other discoveries about the effects of psychosurgery.)

"UTTER LACK OF RESPECT"

The Psychiatric Society's meeting ended with severe criticism of the treatment of insanity by frontal lobotomy. Dr. Nolan D. C. Lewis, director of the New York State Psychiatric Institute of Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center, brought sharp complaints against the practice. Among them was the fact that lobotomy is now being used much too indiscriminately. "Some doctors have shown an utter lack of respect for the human brain," he remarked. "I think it should be stopped before we dement too large a segment of the population." Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D.C., concurred with these conclusions. "We have done less than 100 lobotomies in six years. . . . These patients have not been completely restored and some of their families are extremely disappointed. I am sorry to say that even when they are improved, they are still nothing to brag about. We are not enthusiastic."

According to the *Newsweek*, the Veterans Administration is going to pursue the lobotomy question further, announcing that it will

start an intensive two-to-three-year research to find answers to (1) exactly what changes result from the operation; (2) which types of surgery should be used on which patients; and (3) how the patient compares after surgery with what he was just before it, and with what he was like before he became mentally ill. Such research will be welcome, and might profitably have been undertaken before lobotomy was allowed to be indiscriminately practiced.

ORIENTAL STUDIES

Explaining the methods by which it was proposed to carry out the second object of the Theosophical Movement, H. P. Blavatsky mentioned the importance of library collections of all the good works upon the world's religions, and that one of the aims was "to put into written form correct information upon the various ancient philosophies, traditions, and legends, and disseminate the same in such practicable ways as the translation and publication of original works of value, and extracts from and commentaries upon the same, or the oral instructions of persons learned in their respective departments" *(The Key to Theosophy).* In the same work, she phrased the second object in these words: "To promote the study of Aryan and other Scriptures, of the World's religions and sciences, and to vindicate the importance of old Asiatic literature, namely, of the Brahminical, Buddhist, and Zoroastrian philosophies."

William Q. Judge, following faithfully the lines laid down, was instrumental in securing Buddhist and Hindu representatives at the World's Parliament of Religions held at the Chicago Fair in 1893, and, in furtherance of Aryan studies, he published from time to time *Oriental Department Papers,* thus familiarizing the reading public with the wisdom of many Sanskrit texts. A great deal of work has since been done in this field, throwing more light on the main body of the teachings in *Isis Unveiled* and *The Secret Doctrine.* Even those teachings transmitted orally "are in every instance hinted at in the almost countless volumes of Brahminical, Chinese, and Tibetan temple-literature" (*S.D.* I, xxiii).

BRITISH AND ASIAN SCHOLARSHIP

It must be encouraging, therefore, to theosophical students everywhere, when they read of plans for the expansion of Oriental

studies. Following the report of a Government committee in 1947, many British Universities drew up schemes of development. At Oxford, additional posts have been arranged to include lectures in Indian and Islamic studies, as well as Chinese, Persian, and Turkish, and for an adviser in Eastern art at the Ashmolean Museum. Further, a special grant of £8,000 has been made for the establishment of a Chinese library. Cambridge University has about ten additional lectures in subjects as varied as Semitic epigraphy and modern Chinese and Japanese, and, when personnel is found, Persian, Arabic, Indian, modern Iranian, general Islamic, South Semitic, Mesopotamian, and Far Eastern studies will be pursued. London University's School of Oriental and African Studies is already famous, and it is proposed to treble its present staff in the next five years. It is reported that "all three Universities have schemes of expansion in Russian studies which will be of interest to Orientalists because of the work which the Russians have always done and are still doing in Oriental studies, in relation not only to their own Asiatic possessions but to other eastern territories also" (*The Times*, London, August 3, 1948).

Eastern Studies at Oxford

Meanwhile, the Spalding professorship of Eastern religion and ethics, established for a provisional period in 1935, and held by Professor S. Radhakrishnan (now Indian ambassador to the U.S.S.R.), has now been made a permanent endowment through the munificent gift of £42,000 by Mr. and Mrs. H. N. Spalding, of Oxford. The founders desire to build up in the University—

> a permanent interest in the great religions and ethical systems of the East, whether expressed in philosophic, poetic, devotional, or other literature, in art, in history, and in social life and structure, with the aim of bringing together the world's great religions in closer understanding, harmony, and friendship; as well as to promote cooperation with other universities, bodies, and persons in East and West which pursue the like ends, which purpose is likely to be furthered by the establishment of a professorship, which in the natural course would normally be held by persons of Asian descent.

There is every probability, therefore, that English students will have the advantage of hearing the Hindu and Buddhist philosophies (among others) taught at Oxford University by Eastern teachers.

THE FAR EAST AND THE FAR WEST

In the United States, 40 universities in 22 states are doing work relating to the Far East, and 12 other colleges, distributed over 8 states, are what might be termed primary centers as far as courses in Eastern languages and culture are concerned. These last are Columbia, Cornell, Harvard and Yale; and the universities of California (at Los Angeles and Berkeley), Chicago, Claremont, Michigan, Stanford, Pennsylvania and Washington. In New York City, the Asia Institute offers courses on the history, language, music, philosophy, art and religion of various Eastern peoples, and Columbia University has recently set up an Institute which, though predominantly concerned with China and Japan, has professors teaching Indian philosophy. Among those responsible for spearheading the movement for East-West studies are Dr. Charles A. Moore of the University of Honolulu; Dr. Frederic Spiegelberg of Stanford, a Sanskritist; Dr. Franklin Edgerton, Sanskrit professor at Yale; and Prof. Norman Brown of the University of Pennsylvania. (These men, it may be noted, have contributed to *The Aryan Path*—the monthly published in Bombay, India, which has been long devoted to the interests of East-West cultural unity.)

Purely academic courses naturally can not answer the purpose of the Oriental studies proposed by Mme. Blavatsky and implicit in the Second Object of the movement, for such studies require a definite philosophical background possessed by few scholars. The instinct for essential ideas—for the spirit of a teaching—is, as H.P.B. time and again demonstrates, often lacking in the exoteric expression. The study of Sanskrit, for example, is one thing: a *knowledge* of Sanskrit, another. It is not enough to know Sanskrit terms, for the tremendous reach and range of the Sanskrit vocabulary represents philosophical concepts. "Karma," "devachan," and "skandha," for instance, are—to the student of Theosophy—philosophical terms first, and "Sanskrit words" only secondarily. Yet here in the Sanskrit language is the future link between Eastern and Western philosophy, science, and religion.

"IMPULSE BUYING"

Students of human nature will not be surprised by the fact that technological advances seem to have had a direct effect in stimulating

the emotional, at the expense of the rational, nature of man. Albert Woodruff Gray (*American Perfumer & Essential Oil Review* Dec. 1949), gives the following statistics on the trend in America:

> A survey made of the comparative ratios of planned and impulse buying before and, again, after the last war, showed 24.6 per cent of prewar sales to be based on impulse and 75.4 per cent to be planned purchases. Today that 75.4 per cent of planned buying has dropped to 48.2 per cent and purchases made where emotional urges dictate the buying have increased to 38.2 per cent, substantially two of every five purchases. In this survey 13.6 per cent represented substitutes or merchandise purchases not classifiable under either heading.

The trend toward impulse (or luxury) buying is not a new phenomenon. Dr. Karl T. Compton, President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, estimates that a hundred years ago the American people had 50 desires or wants in consumer goods and of these 16 were necessities. Today, we are told, these wants are 500, of which he estimates 94 are necessities. This represents an increase of almost 600 per cent in what are considered the necessities!

"All Other Items"

Mr. Gray reports on a survey of consumer spending in 1870 and in 1935 made by the National Association of Manufacturers.

> In the earlier year [1870] 11.1 per cent of consumer spending, the balance after disbursements for food, clothing and household expenses, was for "all other items," the luxuries and impulse satisfaction of the time. In 1935 food and clothing expenditures had declined but this disbursement for "all other items" had increased to 34.8 per cent, threefold that of 65 years before.

The significance of these figures becomes evident in the predominance of emotional appeal in general advertisements. A survey of 877 advertisements in the general magazines of the country showed that 60 per cent were based solely on emotional appeal to the readers. Dr. Daniel Starch estimates that the proportion of emotional appeal in advertisements is 80 per cent. How far we are from reducing our desires to the control of our rational nature, from "throwing kama into its own sphere," as Mr. Judge phrased it in his *Ocean of Theosophy*. And how persistently and effectively we are nudged into this softening and debilitating course by the whole tenor of modern advertising and merchandising.

THE "I-APPEAL"

Mr. Gray's article, entitled "Appeal to the 'I' of Your Customer," strikes close to home when he traces the motivation for all impulse or luxury buying to "an effort by the buyer to satisfy some want that has become a mental image in his thoughts and depends for its realization on the acquisition of the goods purchased." That is to say, the emotional nature of the man creates a score of idealized pictures of himself according to the stimulus given, and the man is then impelled to buy those "accessories" which will enable him to make that picture a reality.

> "Not that I would not, if I could, be both handsome and fat, and a great athlete, and make a million a year; be a wit, a bon vivant and a lady killer as well as a philosopher and a philanthropist, statesman, warrior and African explorer," wrote William James, the famous psychologist, of these ridiculous images that people the thought world of every one of us.

STIMULATING THE RIDICULOUS

Mr. Gray, of course, can stand above these delusions and call them ridiculous, *at the same time* seeking for ways to propagate more of them—a graphic illustration of the amoral nature of modern business techniques. In what essential way, considering man's whole nature and evolution, does the advertiser's deliberate stimulation of the uncontrolled emotions of the prospective buyer differ from the tactics of those greatly-to-be-despised leaders of political isms who manipulate large masses of men for their own purposes?

True, the advertiser will say he does not seek to rouse the evil or base emotions of the man (?) but simply to bring out his underlying and harmless desires, but the fact must be faced that it is not *which* desires are stimulated that is important, but that desires are appealed to *at the expense of rational control.* It is not alone *what* is done on impulse—whether buying a bottle of perfume or participating in a mass lynching—that must ultimately be considered. The all-important question is, what kind of a being is the man becoming with every act—what principle of his nature is being strengthened and stimulated? A man who is allowing himself to be conditioned into being 34.8 per cent impulsive desires is becoming, obviously, less of a rational man and more of a potential victim of the emotional advertising of isms, as well as of things.

THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS

DECLARATION

The policy of this Lodge is independent devotion to the cause of Theosophy, without professing attachment to any Theosophical organization. It is loyal to the great Founders of the Theosophical Movement, but does not concern itself with dissensions or differences of individual opinion.

The work it has on hand and the end it keeps in view are too absorbing and too lofty to leave it the time or inclination to take part in side issues. That work and that end is the dissemination of the Fundamental Principles of the philosophy of Theosophy, and the exemplification in practice of those principles, through a truer realization of the SELF; a profounder conviction of Universal Brotherhood.

It holds that the unassailable basis for union among Theosophists, wherever and however situated, is "similarity of aim, purpose and teaching," and therefore has neither Constitution, By-Laws nor Officers, the sole bond between its Associates being that basis. And it aims to disseminate this idea among Theosophists in the furtherance of Unity.

It regards as Theosophists all who are engaged in the true service of Humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, condition or organization, and

It welcomes to its association all those who are in accord with its declared purposes and who desire to fit themselves, by study and otherwise, to be the better able to help and teach others.

"The true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect; yet belongs to each and all."

Being in sympathy with the purposes of this Lodge, as set forth in its "Declaration," I hereby record my desire to be enrolled as an Associate, it being understood that such association calls for no obligation on my part, other than that which I, myself, determine.

The foregoing is the form signed by Associates of the United Lodge of Theosophists. Inquiries are invited from all persons to whom this Movement may appeal. Cards for signatures will be sent upon request, and every possible assistance furnished Associates in their studies and in efforts to form local Lodges. There are no fees of any kind, and no formalities to be complied with. Write to:

GENERAL REGISTRAR, UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS,
Theosophy Hall, 33rd and Grand Ave., Los Angeles (7), Calif.

U. L. T. LODGES

AMSTERDAM, C. HOLLAND.....Keizersgracht 411
BANGALORE CITY, INDIA.....15 Sir Krishna Rao Rd., Basavangudi
BERKELEY (4), CALIFORNIA.....Masonic Temple Bldg., Bancroft and Shattuck
BOMBAY, INDIA.....51 Mahatma Gandhi Road
LONDON (W. 1), ENGLAND.....17 Great Cumberland Place
LONDON, ONTARIO, CANADA.....424 Richmond Street
LOS ANGELES (7), CALIFORNIA.....245 West 33rd Street
MATUNGA, BOMBAY (19), INDIA.....Anandi Nivas, Bhaudaji Road
NEW YORK CITY (22).....22 East Sixtieth Street
PARIS (5), FRANCE.....14 Rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée
PHILADELPHIA (3), PENNSYLVANIA.....1917 Walnut Street
PHOENIX, ARIZONA.....32 North Central Avenue
SACRAMENTO (16), CALIFORNIA.....720 Alhambra Boulevard
SAN DIEGO (1), CALIFORNIA.....307 Orpheum Theatre Bldg., 524 B Street
SAN FRANCISCO (3), CALIFORNIA.....860 Pacific Bldg., 4th and Market Streets
SAN LEANDRO, CALIFORNIA.....1543 Morgan Avenue
SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA.....Federation House, 166 Phillip Street
WASHINGTON (8), D. C.....2653 Connecticut Ave., N. W.

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLICATIONS

Books by H. P. Blavatsky:

ISIS UNVEILED, a photographic facsimile of the Original Edition, the two volumes bound in one	$ 7.50
THE SECRET DOCTRINE, facsimile edition, two volumes in one	8.50
INDEX TO THE SECRET DOCTRINE, for students	3.00
THE SECRET DOCTRINE *and* INDEX	11.00
THE KEY TO THEOSOPHY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
THEOSOPHICAL GLOSSARY, facsimile of Original Edition	3.00
TRANSACTIONS OF THE BLAVATSKY LODGE	2.50
THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE	1.50

Books by William Q. Judge:

THE OCEAN OF THEOSOPHY	2.00
LETTERS THAT HAVE HELPED ME, new and enlarged edition	3.00
THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
NOTES ON THE BHAGAVAD-GITA	1.50
PATANJALI'S YOGA APHORISMS	1.50

Other Books:

THE FRIENDLY PHILOSOPHER, Letters and Talks by Robert Crosbie	3.00
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON THE "OCEAN," by Robert Crosbie	2.00
THE ETERNAL VERITIES, for children, new edition	2.00
TEACHER'S MANUAL AND GUIDE TO THE "ETERNAL VERITIES"	2.50
"BECAUSE—" FOR THE CHILDREN WHO ASK WHY	2.00
LIGHT ON THE PATH, written down by "M.C." (Bombay Ed.)	.75
THROUGH THE GATES OF GOLD, written down by "M.C."	1.50
OCCULT TALES, by H. P. Blavatsky and Wm. Q. Judge	2.00
FROM THE BOOK OF IMAGES, a volume of Indian tales	3.00

Pamphlets:

THEOSOPHY SIMPLY STATED (10 copies, 50 cents; 50 copies, $2.00)	.10
CONVERSATIONS ON THEOSOPHY, including the "Three Fundamental Propositions" of the Secret Doctrine	.10
REINCARNATION AND KARMA, containing the "Aphorisms on Karma" by William Q. Judge	.10
THOUGHTS FOR THINKERS, a helpful essay	.10
WHAT IS DEATH?	.10
THE VOCATION OF LIFE	.10
THE UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS, a statement of its history, purpose and methods	.25
FIVE MESSAGES TO AMERICAN THEOSOPHISTS, by H. P. Blavatsky	.25
EPITOME OF THEOSOPHY, by William Q. Judge	.25
ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT, by William Q. Judge	.25
MORAL EDUCATION, new and enlarged edition	.50
A CHRISTIAN AND A THEOSOPHIST	.25
THE LAWS OF HEALING, Physical and Metaphysical	.50
STATES AFTER DEATH, and Spiritualistic "Communications" Explained	.35
CYCLES OF PSYCHISM, The Import of Psychic Evolution	.50
HYPNOTISM—A PSYCHIC MALPRACTICE	.25

Prices subject to change without notice

Correspondence, orders, etc., should be addressed to

THE THEOSOPHY COMPANY

245 West 33rd Street, Los Angeles (7), California

22-24 East 60th Street, New York (22), New York